

MORE HONESTY NEEDED.

MEDICAL EXPERTS DISCUSSED BY JUSTICE WOODWARD.

Shortcomings of the present system described to a Society of Medical Jurisprudence. Two examples of the dishonesty of some experts—their remedies. Supreme Court Justice John Woodward, who is sitting in the Appellate Division in the Second Judicial District, talked to the doctors and lawyers of the Society of Medical Jurisprudence in the Court House last night about "Expert Medical Testimony." He was down for a defense of the present system, but didn't go very far in its defense. He was emphatic in the declaration that more honesty was needed, and cited some cases that had come under his personal observation where somebody had been a little dishonest, but didn't mention any names. He first showed the necessity of expert evidence and defined an expert as he should be:

"An expert is a specialist, the value of whose evidence given in the form of opinion is proportioned to his character, to his reputation for honesty in the community, to his standing in his specialty or profession. It is not sufficient that he be thought to be wise; he must also be accounted honest. It is not enough that he have a specialty or that he belong to a profession; but he must have such standing in the community as to be considered by his fellows an authority."

Justice Woodward declared then that honesty was the first and all-important essential in an expert no less than in a lay witness. "It is true," he said, "that of late years expert evidence has been cheapened in the eyes of the public, and for this reason it is not far to seek, it is asserted that experts are paid by the side employing them to testify to the advantage of their employers. It is said that the expert, like the lawyer, is a hired man, and that for this reason the testimony of the former should be discounted for the same reason as the testimony of the latter. Both are supposed to be interested and swayed by the bias of the moment."

Justice Woodward went on to say that other witnesses, if convicted to swearing falsely, were subjected to the same punishment as the expert, and the fact that occasionally some expert had given guilty and seasoned did not militate against the value of the testimony of the honest expert. "Should not an expert, if guilty of the same crime, also be sentenced to the same punishment, and why should the fact of his being an expert, and his having given testimony, be taken into consideration in the punishment of the expert?"

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

Justice Woodward then gave two illustrations showing the dishonesty of some experts. One case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury. The other case was of a man, a doctor, who had examined a woman, and found that she was not pregnant, and he had sworn to that effect. The woman was a March bore, and she had a child, and the doctor was charged with perjury.

SHOT AT CHAPMAN'S RAIDERS.

The 22 Men Arrested in the Cafe Odessa Discharged by Magistrate Stams.

Chapman's chief ward man, E. Wesley Hall, and Assistant Ward Men Watson Scherhorn, Orville Augustus Hatfield and Stanley Upward escorted twenty-two alleged members of the East Market Court yesterday morning. They were arrested on Sunday afternoon in the Cafe Odessa, at 105 Allen street, run by Harris Rosenbaum, and were charged with gambling for real money. Stanley Upward carried the money which was seized through the quick work of the guard. It consisted of \$2.47 in pennies, dimes and nickels.

The gambling paraphernalia was brought along in the patrol wagon. It consisted of two decks of regular playing cards, three long pencils, a slate, two dice pencils and a piece of chalk. The articles were wrapped in thick brown paper and with a rope. The package was also sealed with red sealing wax and marked "Evidence procured at raid on gambling den at 105 Allen street on Dec. 11."

The twenty-two men, who were dressed in civilian clothes, were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case. The men were lined up in a policeman in civilian clothes who was interested in another case.

BLOW TO LONG FRANCHISE.

CHICAGO'S CITY COUNCIL GIVES EXTENSION A SHARP SETBACK.

Ordinance Taken to Take the Streets and Alleys Committee and Sent to the City Council. The Extensionists Lost Eight Votes.

Chicago, Dec. 12.—The street railway franchise extension ordinance received a sharp setback in to-night's meeting of the City Council. The roll call to-night showed that several Aldermen who were known to have favored the passage of the ordinance had been whipped into line by the opponents of the measure. There were no sensational features in connection with the franchise discussion in the Council.

A motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The vote on that motion showed that, for the present at least, the ordinance stands no show of passage. There were thirty-eight votes for and thirty-two against reconsideration. A motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys. The motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the ordinance had been referred to the Committee on Streets and Alleys.

THE OPERA.

"Romero and Juliet" Pleasingly Repeated at the Metropolitan.

"Romero and Juliet" was upon the stage of the Metropolitan last evening for the second time this season. It was done in French, with the cast precisely as upon the former occasion, as follows:

Juliette.....Miss. Milla
Stephano.....Mlle. Baumeister
Fernand.....M. de Beas
The rest of the cast was as upon the former occasion.

Melba was not in her best voice, and probably for that reason saved her strength, giving out as little as possible either in tone or in dramatic expression. M. Saldaña confirmed the impression which he made upon his first appearance by being in the best of voice and a charming artist. His high, open tones are especially sympathetic, his intonation refreshingly correct and his intuitive musical feeling very sensitive. The love scene was exquisitely tender, the last scene, as it did at the previous performance, intensely touching and tragic.

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

Before 10 o'clock Mrs. Duncan suddenly thought about the Buck children. She walked around through the alley and looked at the window to see if the children were there. The curtains were gone. She thought something must be wrong. Going into the hallway, she slipped on the floor and found the children in a heap. She was nearly all alone when she saw the children. She was nearly all alone when she saw the children.

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

LOCKED IN WITH FLAMES.

THREE LITTLE CHILDREN SET THEMSELVES AFIRE.

Henry Buck, a tar roofer, who lives on the first floor of a rear tenement, at 87 Sullivan street, Brooklyn, not far from the Erie Basin, went away to work yesterday morning, leaving his three children locked up in the house. His wife had gone away earlier to do the washing of a family in President street. Buck left the house key with Mary Duncan, who lives in the basement of a house nearby. After their father had gone, the children played around the kitchen stove. Their dresses caught fire, and when the neighbors broke into the rooms they found Emma, 3 years old, burned to death. Jennie, 5 years old, was alive, but so badly burned that she died four hours later at the Long Island College Hospital. The baby, John, 15 months old, was not burned, but a little longer in the smoke would have killed him.

Buck gave Mrs. Duncan the key about 7 o'clock, telling her to run in and look after the children in the morning when she had time. "No need of going in before 10 o'clock," he said, "because they will be asleep."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

The children had often been left alone that way, when both father and mother went out to work. One day Jennie made some tea, and triumphantly told Mrs. Duncan when she came in. "Don't you ever do that again," Mrs. Duncan warned them. "Keep away from the stove."

REIGN OF TERROR IN PEKING.

Many Executions "of a Private Nature"—Dowager Empress Blotting Out Reformers.

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 12.—Late advices from Peking show that the Empress Dowager has not assisted with the execution of her subjects by her orders, and that executions "of a private nature" have been going on at the rate of two a week. The majority of the victims have been eunuchs, palace slaves girls, and ladies-in-waiting. All were such as had been looked upon with favor by her imperial master, with the exception of four or five palaces menials and four ladies-in-waiting, whose active devotion to the Emperor led to their immediate beheading. All the others underwent mock trials, but all the trials ended in prompt conviction. The Empress Dowager's private executions on many persons who had incurred her wrath, and a genuine reign of terror has prevailed in the palace.